

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 10-21, 23-31, 33, and 34 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 16, and 26 have been amended; the amendments provide no change to the scope of the claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 10, 12-13, 15-21, 23, 25-31, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091798 to Joshi et al. (hereinafter "Joshi"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim . . . ." With regard to independent claims 1, 16, and 26, Applicants submit that Joshi fails to teach every element of those claims.

In particular, Joshi fails to teach at least "wherein the transitory link is a symbolic link" as recited in the independent claims 1, 16, and 26. This is described in detail in the Applicants' response dated July 13, 2007. In the final office action dated Aug. 2, 2007, the Examiner argues that the Applicants' reliance on passages from the specification at issue regarding a symbolic link to provide interpretation of the claimed symbolic link, are per the Examiner, "are not recited in the claim(s) (and) Although claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims." Applicants' disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this as reading limitations from the specification into the claims. However, claims 1, 16, and 26 have been amended, though unnecessarily, to provide in claim language the interpretation of the claimed symbolic link clearly set forth in the specification. In particular, the independent claims have been amended to provide "wherein the symbolic link is an indirect pointer to a file." As a symbolic link would have been clearly interpreted as such before the amendment, this amendment provides no change to the scope of the claim.

In reference to the Examiner's argument that Joshi provides a symbolic link, the Examiner appears to have taken the position that Joshi's "encrypted authentication cookie" and Joshi's description that a resource having a resource name that includes a file name, wherein the file name may include the path name to the file, reads on Applicants' "symbolic link." As described in further detail in the previous response, this is clearly erroneous. A cookie, as described by Joshi, stores information such as an authentication level and user ID and is passed to the user's browser. See Joshi [0147] and [0209]. This is clearly distinct from a symbolic link. The cookie allows access to a resource, the name of the resource including a path name to the file. See Joshi [0081]. Thus, the cited sections of Joshi teach a name (which includes a path name) assigned to a resource (e.g. file). This name assigned to a file is also specifically not a symbolic link which is an indirect pointer to a file.

Furthermore, in [0147] of Joshi, if an encrypted authentication cookie is passed to the user's browser the user may request a second resource (i.e. after a first resource) protected by a different policy domain if the authentication level of the first resource is equal to or greater than that of the second resource. The second resource would be a distinct resource (e.g. file) from the first resource (e.g. file). As such, the system of Joshi is a system for which the Applicants specifically provide a solution in the current disclosure by using a symbolic link to a file. The claimed elements including the symbolic link may be used to prevent exactly what the Joshi system provides, that is, giving access that would allow a user to access more than one file. See [0048] of application at issue (published version).

Claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15, 17-23, 25, and 27-34 depend from and further limit claims 1, 16, and 26 and are therefore also not anticipated by Joshi for at least that reason.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 11, 14, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Joshi in view of Official Notice. In response, Applicants submit that, because claims 11, 14, and 24 depend from and further limit claims 1 and 16, the claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth above with reference to claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **Conclusions**

For at least the reasons set forth in detail above, all of the pending claims are now deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the pending rejections and issue a formal notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,




David M. O'Dell  
Registration No. 42,044

Dated: September 10, 2007

HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 214/651-5896  
Facsimile: 214/200-0853  
Client Matter No.: 2003-0420 / 24061.85

R-175260\_1.DOC

Certificate of Service
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on <u>9-10-2007</u> .
 Bonnie Boyle